

REMARKS

Claims 1-31 are pending in the application. Claims 1-31 stand rejected. Claims 1, 7, 8, 11, 15, 17, 26 and 27 have been amended herein. Claims 32-36 have been added. Applicant traverses the rejections.

Examiner's Interview

Applicant's representative would like to thank Examiner Kan and the Examiner's supervisor Kakali Chaki for the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative, John V. Biernacki, during the telephone interview on June 17, 2004. During the interview, private state data of objects was discussed. More specifically, claims 1 and 26 were discussed as related to capturing private state data from objects in order to store private object state data. The distinction between private object state data and public object state data was discussed. The ability to store the order in which the private object state data is to be restored was discussed relative to claim 11 as well as the capturing of design-time information relative to claim 24. The remarks and the amendments contained herein further summarize the interview.

Specification

The use of the trademarks JavaBeans and Java has been indicated in the application with the appropriate trademark indicia where the terms first appear in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 7, 15 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 7, 15 and 17 have been amended to clarify the subject matter. However, the amendments to these claims do not result in a narrowing of the claimed subject matter; rather a clarification has resulted for what was already present in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Johnson (XML JavaBeans series, Part 1-3, published 2-7/1999, JavaWorld; hereinafter “Johnson”). Applicant traverses the instant rejection.

Claim 1 recites that private state data is stored for an object that has been created within an object development environment. As recited in claim 1, the private state data is obtained by querying an object with respect to its private object state. In this way, the method of claim 1 can allow for storing both private data as well as public data for later restoring.

In contrast, the Johnson reference discusses saving public state information and not private state data as required in claim 1. Public state data is significantly different than private state data. Public state data is data that can be retrieved via such methods as public method calls or public fields. Private state data is an object’s internal state data which is not accessible via the object’s public interface. Since many objects contain internal states that should be captured in order to properly restore them later (such as at

runtime), the method of claim 1 allows for the capturing and restoring of this important state data, whereas Johnson cannot.

Because the Johnson reference does not disclose querying an object for its private state data so that private state data may be obtained and stored as required by claim 1 in combination with its other limitations, claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over Johnson. Because claim 26 and its dependent claims also recite subject matter that includes handling an object's private state data in combination with their respective limitations, these claims are allowable as well.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with other positions contained in the Office Action. For example, claim 11 requires, in combination with its other limitations, that a restoration order is determined such that first private object state data is to be restored before second private object state data because of an interdependency between the first private object state data and the second private object state data. This is useful in many situations, such as when at runtime several values have interdependencies. As a non-limiting example, a spin control is an object with a particular property whose value is bounded by two of the object's other properties. The "count" property of the spin control is bounded by its associated "minCount" and "maxCount" properties. If the boundary parameters are not set before the bound value, an invalid state could result during object restoration, resulting in a runtime error. Claim 11 allows a restoration order to be specified. Accordingly in this example, a spin control can be reconstructed in an order that sets the boundary parameters before the bound value, thereby eliminating a possible runtime error. Because the Johnson reference does not disclose such processing limitations of claim 11, claim 11 is allowable for this additional reason.

As another example where Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office Action, claim 24 recites, in combination with its other limitations, determining design time object state data associated with the objects used within the object development environment so that the design time object state data can be later restored for use during design time. In contrast, the Johnson reference does not disclose an object writing out two different representations of itself such that it is restored differently in design-time and run-time contexts. Because the Johnson reference does not disclose such processing limitations of claim 24, claim 24 is allowable for this additional reason.

CONCLUSIONS

For the above-stated reasons, claims 1-36 are allowable over the cited reference. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this case to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

July 21, 2004

By:

John V. Biernacki

John V. Biernacki
Reg. No. 40,511
JONES DAY
North Point
901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(216) 586-3939